

*Compliments to
The Contributor.*

Letters of Carl Schurz, B. Gratz Brown, James S. Rollins,
G. G. Vest *et al.*, Missourians, from the Private
Papers and Correspondence of Senator
James Rood Doolittle of
Wisconsin.¹

Contributed by Duane Mowry, of Milwaukee, Wis.

The copies of documents herewith submitted for publication in The Missouri Historical Review besides having local interest and significance, are really of historical value. They deal, in several instances, at least, with important problems, political, financial, and economic. Several of the Carl Schurz letters and those of Judge Doolittle and Senator Vest certainly come under these headings. So also does that of the Hon. B. Gratz Brown.

It is true that the Schurz letters were written before their author became a citizen of St. Louis. But they are letters of political and historical interest, and in the opinion of the contributor, it is eminently fitting that they find a place in the historical collections of Mr. Schurz's adopted state.

No attempt has been made to connect the letters with certain events to which they undoubtedly specifically refer. That would be an interesting historical exercise. Students of the subject and the time can easily verify much that is indicated in the letters, or in some of them at all events.

—Duane Mowry.

¹James Rood Doolittle was born in Hampton, Washington county, N. Y., Jan. 3, 1815, and died at Providence, R. I., July, 27, 1897. During the last half of the nineteenth century, Mr. Doolittle was a public and national character of no ordinary ability or worth. Excepting four years at Geneva (now Hobart) College, where he graduated in 1834, and a few years, when he studied and practiced law at Rochester, he resided in Wyoming county, N. Y., until in 1851, he removed to Racine, Wis.

*Consigned to
The Contributor.*

Letters of Carl Schurz, B. Gratz Brown, James S. Rollins,
G. G. Vest *et al.*, Missourians, from the Private
Papers and Correspondence of Senator
James Rood Doolittle of
Wisconsin.¹

Contributed by Duane Mowry, of Milwaukee, Wis.

The copies of documents herewith submitted for publication in The Missouri Historical Review besides having local interest and significance, are really of historical value. They deal, in several instances, at least, with important problems, political, financial, and economic. Several of the Carl Schurz letters and those of Judge Doolittle and Senator Vest certainly come under these headings. So also does that of the Hon. B. Gratz Brown.

It is true that the Schurz letters were written before their author became a citizen of St. Louis. But they are letters of political and historical interest, and in the opinion of the contributor, it is eminently fitting that they find a place in the historical collections of Mr. Schurz's adopted state.

No attempt has been made to connect the letters with certain events to which they undoubtedly specifically refer. That would be an interesting historical exercise. Students of the subject and the time can easily verify much that is indicated in the letters, or in some of them at all events.

—Duane Mowry.

¹James Rood Doolittle was born in Hampton, Washington county, N. Y., Jan. 3, 1815, and died at Providence, R. I., July, 27, 1897. During the last half of the nineteenth century, Mr. Doolittle was a public and national character of no ordinary ability or worth. Excepting four years at Geneva (now Hobart) College, where he graduated in 1834, and a few years, when he studied and practiced law at Rochester, he resided in Wyoming county, N. Y., until in 1851, he removed to Racine, Wis.

F586
J69

In 1853 he was made judge of the first judicial circuit of Wisconsin, but resigned in 1856 to become United States Senator, having been elected as a democrat-republican in the place of that eminent son of Missouri, Henry Dodge. He served Wisconsin in the United States Senate from 1857 to 1869. While in Congress he was a member and chairman of several important committees and was regarded by his colleagues as an exceptionally able man. In 1861 he was a member of the peace convention, but opposed all compromise with the South. In 1866 he was president of the national union convention at Philadelphia. He exerted a strong influence as a unionist, and in the Senate was one of the foremost debaters on war and reconstruction measures, supporting the administration. Believing that each state should regulate its own internal affairs, he opposed and voted against the fifteenth amendment. His position on such questions placed him in close relation with Schurz, Brown, Rollins, and other Missourians of national prominence. After leaving the Senate in 1869, he practiced law in Racine and Chicago, and for years was professor in the Law School of Chicago University, a trustee from its foundation, and for one year its president. In 1872 he presided over the national democratic convention at Baltimore, that nominated Horace Greeley for the presidency.

In 1856, Mr. Doolittle withdrew from the democratic party because of his strong anti-slavery views, and supported the candidate of the new republican party, John C. Fremont. His great oratorical ability soon made him a national figure on the political stump. The victory of the new party in 1860, placed Senator Doolittle high in the councils of the Nation. It was his good fortune to be very much in the confidence of President Lincoln and later he also had great faith in the judgment and patriotism of President Johnson. Knowing well Lincoln's reconstruction policy, he strongly championed that of his successor. His independence and courage, however, cost him political prestige at home. Together with Lincoln he maintained that colonization was the solution of the negro problem.

The high moral courage of Senator Doolittle must have appealed strongly to such kindred spirits as Schurz, Brown and Rollins. The following letters, all too few, reveal exceptionally close friendships. His return to the democratic party gave him no new honors, in fact the greatest disappointment of his life was the refusal of President Cleveland to give him a foreign mission in Austria or Russia. His ambition was open and known to all; his integrity, unquestioned; and his ability, of the highest. These letters, while especially valuable to Missouri as representative of their distinguished authors, also serve as sidelights on the character of one of Wisconsin's great statesman.

EDITOR.

(*Nat'l. Cyclo. of Am. Biog.*, IV. 144, James T. White & Co., N. Y., 1893. Mowry, *An Appreciation of James Rood Doolittle*, in *Proceedings, Wis. Hist. Soc.*, pp. 281-296, 1909.)

Given
A. Mowry
Apr 2 1909

FROM CARL SCHURZ.

Confidential

MILWAUKEE, Aug. 18th, 1859.*

My dear sir:

The congressional documents you had the kindness to send me, are received, and I thank you for having remembered me.—A mutual friend of ours has communicated to me your views on our next state campaign, as you expressed them in a letter addressed to him. I hope you will not consider this a breach of confidence. These are matters of common interest and there ought to be a full understanding among those who have to work side by side.

I will avail myself of this opportunity to state my position to you, fully and frankly. My name is before the people in connection with the governorship. The nomination and election to that office cannot improve my political standing; it cannot benefit me financially; I can have no ambition to gratify in that way,—and so I would stopped the thing at once, if I had looked upon the matter from a mere personal point of view, or if it had presented itself to my mind as a matter of mere state-interest. But it seemed to me that, leaving aside all personal considerations, my nomination and election would have a vast influence upon the national campaign in 1860. Wisconsin occupies a prominent and proud position in the phalanx of Republican States. We have raised the standard of consistent Republicanism, untarnished by Know-Nothingism, presenting a bold front to federal usurpation. Other states have committed grave blunders like Massachusetts, or faltered like Ohio; we have stood firm.

*It is to be observed that this letter was written when Mr. Schurz was a resident of Wisconsin. He had not then reached the prominence of a national figure. But he was in the political game in the fullest sense of the term. And he wanted to impress upon Senator Doolittle that the German vote in Wisconsin must be reckoned with.

One thing that is the subject of remark is the splendid diction of the letter. At that time Mr. Schurz had not been a citizen of the United States for more than seven years, coming in 1852 from the Fatherland from which he was a political refugee in 1849.

DUANE MOWRY.

Against the first we have protested with words, against the latter with acts. In this respect my nomination would, in the opinion of a great many true men in this and other states, be a bold and manly demonstration. It would nail our flag to the mast; it would make Wisconsin the representative of true Republican consistency; it would make our state the nucleus of the truly democratic element of the Republican party. Thus, I thought, with my name at the head of the ticket, we would fight here the first great skirmish of the battle of 1860, and the result would have a considerable effect on the tendency and spirit of the national convention. My election, (such was the opinion) would be worth to our presidential candidate more than 50,000 votes, and I would go before the people of the U. S. in the campaign as an exponent of true Republicanism. I would put down the Massachusetts amendment by merely showing myself, and our fight would once more become an aggressive one.—This is the way I looked at this matter, and I must confess, nothing could have been more distasteful to me than to see the public papers picking up little personal claims, small local considerations and political quibbles, in order to puff this candidate and disparage the other. I cannot help taking comprehensive views of politics and I would never feel called upon to mix up with small local squabbles in order to decide petty personal contests.—If the Republicans of Wisconsin judge our next state-election from this point of view, I shall stake my whole political existence on the result. If the contest is to be narrowed down to the mere question, what man shall occupy the executive office and be dubbed governor for the next two years, my place is not in the ring.

If I could have foreseen the petty discussions to which the bringing forward of my name has given rise, I would have declined four weeks ago. The matter was not put upon the ground where I wanted to have it. Meanwhile the thing has gone on, and the difficulties we have to confront become more perplexing every day. Before going farther let me say that in case of my nomination, I have no serious doubts as to the result of the election. After a careful survey of the

ground I find, that I could command at least 8000 German votes outside of the Rep. party. That figure is not unlikely to run up to 9000 or 10000. Of 4000 I am perfectly sure. In so far, I think I would not jeopardize the chances of the party for my political "aspirations."—Now let me say a few words on the small business of the next campaign. I have none but friendly feelings for Gov. Randall, but I must confess that of all the candidates mentioned, I consider him the weakest. His nomination two years ago left the people perfectly cold; hence the small vote and the partial defeat of the ticket. His administration was on the whole a good one; but he has committed blunders enough to make a considerable number of opponents inside of the party. I think his re-nomination would leave the people just as cold as it did in '59, and while he then barely escaped defeat with no Republicans actively working against him, what will his fate be now, since a number of influential members of the party have declared that they will openly bolt his nomination? Besides this, he cannot get more than half of the German Republican vote in consequence of the appointments he made and several other things, and if I went to work from the day of his nomination to the day of election, I could not give him two thirds of the German votes he obtained in '59. If we did not stand just before a presidential campaign, and if Wisconsin did not occupy her proud representative position, I might perhaps say, that a defeat would be wholesome exercise for the Rep. party of this state—(they have to be whipped out of their wire-pulling proclivities.) But as things are we cannot afford to jeopardize the success of the party for the claims and aspirations of an individual.)

My belief that Gov. Randall cannot be re-elected, is so strong, that I have offered some of his friends to withdraw my name from the contest provided he would withdraw his, thus sacrificing my plans of a brilliant political operation to the safety of the party in the state election. This proposition seems to have met with little favor. If I could have foreseen the perplexities we have run into, I would have discountenanced the first attempt to bring my name before the people.

If I decline now, Gov. R.'s re-nomination is sure and defeat in the election exceedingly probable. I do not want that. If my name is presented to the convention and I am beaten there, it might seriously injure the chances of the candidate nominated, and I do not like that. (The feeling among the the Germans is very strong and I shall hardly be able to control it.)

Your suggestion that I should take some subordinate nomination cannot consistently be carried out. My experience is against it. To be sandwiched in a ticket and to fight a defensive battle for others is a thing which I cannot very well afford to do. I do not like to make my chances depend on other people's merits. If I should ever be a candidate again I am determined to run on my own strength and my own responsibility. I intend to do some work next year, and it would be very unwise to assume the risks of other people this fall. Besides this, if my election is to have any effect on the presidential campaign, none but the most conspicuous position will serve. For these and other reasons equally strong, I shall absolutely decline any subordinate nomination. But if we want to preserve even one-half of the German vote in case of my defeat in the convention, it is absolutely necessary that a German be on the ticket. Some demonstration must be made in that way. This thing is not an easy one to manage. It will not only be difficult to find a suitable man, but it will be still more difficult to find a suitable place for that man,—unless the convention throw Hastings overboard, a proceeding which would be neither just nor safe. How these and other difficulties are to be overcome I do not see yet. They are perplexing now; they may become fatal. The only way to adjust these matters will be to have an informal meeting and a free consultation of the delegates before the convention proceeds to its regular business. There a full interchange of views may be had and the convention will not act blindly. I am very anxious to avoid all of these difficulties and this can be done only by coming to an understanding in time. I should be very glad to see the Convention composed of the truest and most earnest Republicans of the state; your presence there as

a delegate, my dear sir, would certainly do much to keep things in the right track. Your advice will have great weight with every member of the party, and the respect due to your person and position might prevent their discussions from becoming excited and violent.

I should have preferred to see these matters settled before the primary meetings take place, so as to prevent the packing of the Convention, which always will have a bad moral effect. But there seems to be no way to do it.

I tell you all this not in order to induce you to do this or that but merely in order to explain to you my motives and prevent misapprehensions from springing up between us. We may have to work side by side very often and it is better that we should understand each other. It is hardly necessary to add, that if the Convention should come to conclusions different from the views I have taken, I would, perhaps not without some regret, give up a place which promised to produce brilliant results, but I shall, without personal feeling, most cheerfully accept their decision and faithfully work for the success of our principles, however gloomy the prospects may be.

Yours sincerely,

C. SCHURZ.

HON. J. R. DOOLITTLE,
Racine.

FROM CARL SCHURZ.

Milwaukee, Nov. 7th, 1859.³

HON. JAMES R. DOOLITTLE,
Racine.

Dear Sir:

I have just received your favor of Nov. 5th. I return you my hearty thanks for your kind assistance in the matter of the Republican press. About a month ago I had to take up one of the notes and had to borrow the money to do it with. That paper is just now coming due and I was running about for

³The "Hobart" referred to was the Hon. Harrison C. Hobart, a well-known and prominent Wisconsin Democrat of that time and a resident of Milwaukee.

DUANE MOWRY.

the purpose of raising money. Your check and the other certificate of deposit saved me from a great embarrassment. In a few days I shall go East. Whatever contribution may be made for the purpose of sustaining our press, it will be well invested capital. Please communicate about this matter with the officers of our Republican Club here. But, if possible, let something be done for the "Volks Zeitung" in Watertown.

We are in full fight here, and I may possibly have a debate with Hobart to-night. I have just challenged him.

Yours sincerely,

C. SCHURZ.

FROM CARL SCHURZ.

Boston, Jan. 12th, 1860.⁴

HON. J. R. DOOLITTLE,

My dear friend:

Yesterday I sent you a copy of the speech I delivered in Springfield a few days ago. If the argument contained in the first part is followed up, you may place Douglas between two fires and oblige him to take either one or the other position with all its consequences. This will either entirely destroy him at the South or bring about a rupture with his Northern friends. I should be glad to have that speech published in one of the leading eastern papers. Perhaps the Washington "Republic" or the "National Era" would reprint it.

I shall probably return to Wisconsin in two or three weeks. If possible, I shall pay you a short visit at Washington, if I do not find it too expensive.

Tell me what you think of the speech (that is to say openly, unreservedly and without restraint) and, please, direct your letter care of Fred. Kapp, Esq., New York. It

⁴In this letter there is clear evidence of the political shrewdness of Mr. Schurz. Undoubtedly, he correctly analyzed the political attitude of Stephen A. Douglas. Subsequent events confirmed his viewpoint. Whatever else may be said of him, Mr. Schurz was, by this time, coming into national importance. He was much wanted to address German audiences throughout the country. These, of course, were of a political nature, only.

will find me there at the commencement of next week, until Wednesday or Thursday. What are the prospects in regard to the speakership? Do you not think it would be best to change the time for holding the National Convention? It seems to be the general opinion, that it should be held some time before the middle of May, and I think so myself. If this is your view I think it would be well to address letters to the Chairman of the National Com. and urge him to address a circular to the several members. In that way the change might be effected before it is too late. This matter is certainly of great importance.

My best regards to our friends in Washington.

Yours truly,

C. SCHURZ.

P. S. There are some typographical errors in the report of my speech. In the 12th line of the 4th column there is a “;” wanting between the words “said” and “history;” and in the 26th line of the 5th column counting from the bottom upward “abusive ordinance” ought to read “obscure ordinance.” That is all I can now think of.

C. S.

FROM CARL SCHURZ.

Philadelphia, Jan. 31st, '60.⁵

HON. J. R. DOOLITTLE.

My dear friend:

I had to leave Washington without bidding you and Mrs. Doolittle good-bye. Please offer Mrs. Doolittle my highest regards.

You told me that a translation into German of my speech on Douglas was desired and I think I had better make that translation myself. I wish to read the proof also, and in order to do this, would it not be best to have the printing done in Wisconsin? I understand you pay \$1. for an 8 page pamphlet in German; we might do that for the same price at

⁵Of this letter, it can be said that Mr. Schurz was taking cognizance of important political event in order that he might contribute to the success of the Republican party. The “America for Americans” slogan evidently had little interest for him.

DUANE MOWRY.

home and thereby favor our papers with a little job. The thing can be done for you just as cheap and a great deal better. Please let me know what you think about it and how many copies you want, and I will see the job done.

Can you send me a copy of Biglers bill in relation to the prevention of invasions and conspiracies, etc. It is a valuable campaign-document.

I fear that Sherman's defeat (for it was a defeat) will have a bad effect on the action of the National Convention. The true Republicans will have to stand firmly together or they will be overridden by the Americans and old-line Whigs, and the whole campaign will be a tame affair.

I would have left for home before this, but I found Mrs. Schurz sick and unable to travel. We shall hardly get started before the middle of next week.

My address here is: Care of Dr. H. Tiedemann, 445 N. 5th Str., Philadelphia, Pa.

Yours as ever,

C. SCHURZ.

FROM CARL SCHURZ.

Philad. Feb. 11th, '60.*

HON. J. R. DOOLITTLE.

My dear friend:

I have translated my speech and the translation is printed in the "Freie Presse," the German Republ. paper of this city. The editor will send you a printed copy of the translation which may be stereotyped. Please send me a few copies of the pamphlet (in English) for distribution among our friends in Wisconsin. I intend to leave to-morrow night for home. The speech is working well wherever it is read.

You tell me that Douglas' chances seem to be rising in the South. I think you may press him about the inconsistencies of his doctrine so as to make him own up one way or the

*This letter shows the innate cleverness of the political acumen of Mr. Schurz. It also makes plain that Mr. Schurz understood the political game locally as well as nationally. The "Dixon" mentioned was the Hon. Luther S. Dixon, for many years a justice of the supreme court of Wisconsin.

DUANE MOWRY.

other; and besides you can squeeze him strongly about his "alien and sedition laws;" you may destroy him completely at the North. I think he is at your mercy now, and you ought not to spare him.

All I hear and see here is very encouraging. A judicious nomination will secure us Pennsylvania beyond peradventure, and I think, even a bold one will not endanger our success very much. I had several letters from Wisconsin lately; the approaching judicial election gives our friends considerable trouble. Dixon will not accept a party nomination and refuses to lend himself to factious purposes in any way. But I understand he would allow himself to be called out as an independent candidate in case A. D. Smith should run.

Give my best regards to Mrs. Doolittle and remember me to our friends generally.

Yours as ever,

C. SCHURZ.

P. S.—I should like to read the proof of the German pamphlet.

C. S.

FROM B. GRATZ BROWN.

Oct. 17, 1870.¹

My Dear Senator:

I have just returned from a very arduous canvass of thirty days in the northern part of the state [Missouri] and find your very kind and sympathetic letter. This, you will understand, of course, is a bitter fight in Missouri, first because it is death to the "rings," and second because it has its ulterior

¹It would seem that this letter forecasts the Liberal Republican movement which finally culminated in the nomination of Horace Greeley for president and B. Gratz Brown for vice-president by the Liberal Republicans and endorsed by the Democrats. Governor Brown was known to be the responsible head of that movement. And Senator Doolittle was an avowed sympathizer of it. It would be interesting to know what was the tenor of Judge Doolittle's letter which called forth this reply. But it is also to be regretted that it was rarely Mr. Doolittle's practice to keep copies of letters of this character. And none has been found by the contributor.

It is to be borne in mind that Judge Doolittle figured prominently in the National Convention which placed Greeley and Brown in nomination as presidential candidates.

DUANE MOWRY.

significance and there will be nothing left undone on either side to decide the issue.

I can only say to you in a few hurried words that I will win by not less than thirty thousand majority—the President [Grant] and his influence to the contrary notwithstanding.

I thank you and the other friends in other states for your good feeling in this matter. Perhaps I am not the right man to have taken the lead in such a conflict; but there was no other that would do it, and the thing had to be done. So you see, despite all my wishes and all my designs, I am involved in politics again much to the detriment of my agricultural plans.

With many pleasant reminiscences of our intercourse in the Senate, and with feelings of the warmest personal attachment, I remain,

Very truly and hastily yours,

B. GRATZ BROWN.

HON. J. R. DOOLITTLE,
Chicago.

FROM JAS. S. ROLLINS.

Columbia, Missouri, Jan'y 29th, 1866*.

My Dear Sir:

The views of yourself and Mr. Cowan, of Penn'a, accord so perfectly with my own, in regard to the proper policies to

*Although there is nothing in the letter to indicate it, there can be no doubt that it was written to the then Senator James R. Doolittle of Wisconsin. It was carefully preserved in his private papers and correspondence. The political attitude of Senators Doolittle and Cowan, with reference to the administration of President Johnson, were known to be in substantial accord. It is this harmony which calls forth the approval of Mr. Rollins. It was also well understood that Senators Sumner and Wilson of Massachusetts and Howe of Wisconsin, were in direct antagonism to the President and his policies. A strong and growing sentiment was at work against the President among those who entertained extreme radical Republican views with regard to the questions growing out of the Civil War. All this was the subject of public discussion and debate at the time this letter was written. Mr. Rollins, evidently, wanted to assist in making public opinion in favor of the policy championed by Senator Doolittle. He wanted to distribute his speeches as a means of carrying out his plan of promoting the cause, which, however, was destined to be met with disaster and defeat at a later date.

DUANE MOWRY.

be pursued, in getting the Government back upon the old pathway, that I must ask the favor of you to send me a dozen or two copies of your speeches, under your frank—if they have been put up in pamphlet form.

Missouri will stand firmly by the President—in the course which he seems to have marked out for himself,—and we rely upon such statesmen as yourself and Mr. Cowan—to ward off the blows aimed at him by Sumner, Wilson, Howe & Company.

I am very truly,

Your friend,

JAS. S. ROLLINS.

FROM T. O. HOWE, *In Re* JNO. C. TRUESDELL.

To His Excellency Andrew Johnson,

President of the United States.⁹

The undersigned Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States have great pleasure in recommending Mr. John C. Truesdell, of St. Louis, Mo., a gentleman of ability and integrity for appointment as one of the Commissioners under

“An Act to reimburse the State of Missouri for moneys expended for the United States in enrolling, equipping, and provisioning militia forces to aid in suppressing the Rebellion.”

T. O. HOWE.

⁹The signature attached to the foregoing document is in the handwriting of Senator Timothy O. Howe, of Wisconsin. Whether other “Senators and Representatives in the Congress” signed similar documents, the contributor has no means at hand of knowing. Nor does he know if Mr. Truesdell received the appointment. But the publication of the document itself may be a bit of interesting information for the friends and admirers of Mr. Truesdell in Missouri. And the reproduction of it is offered in that belief.

DUANE MOWRY.

FROM JNO. C. TRUESDELL.

Saint Louis, Dec. 1st, 1865 ¹⁰

HON. J. R. DOOLITTLE,

Washington, D. C.

My Dear Sir:

Mr. Geo. W. Sturgis, of Geneva, in your state, wants to be Post M. on the Altantic & Mississippi Co.'s line from here to New Orleans.

He is a very worthy man. Was the agent of the state at this place during a part of the war. Stands well here and would make a good officer and ought to have the appointment.

If you can help him, you will confer a bounty upon a worthy man and a favor upon me.

In 1868 I expect to help nominate and elect you to the Presidency. I always had great faith in your conservatism. If I had been in the State Senate, as I should have been upon a fair count of the votes cast, I should have voted to continue you where you are. But I am in Missouri now and in state matters in Wisconsin, can neither help nor harm you. I was rejoiced when I read your speeches made during the late canvass in Wisconsin. They were sound.

My enclosed business card will advise you what I am doing here.

Very truly yours,

JNO. C. TRUESDELL.

¹⁰Evidently, Mr. Truesdell was a former resident of Wisconsin and a constituent of the then Senator Doolittle of that state.

TO G. G. VEST.

Chicago, Aug. 15th, 1893¹¹.

HON. MR. VEST,
Washn, D. C.

My dear Senator:

I cannot withhold for a single day, the expression of my great satisfaction at your speaking in defense of Bi-Metalism as reported in the Press this morning. Imperfect as the report is, I see the drift and substance of your speech.

It is the most important question, of all others, since the close of the war, and the restoration of home rule to the states of the South under the Constitution; and, yet it is a subject attended with great difficulties in getting a fair and impartial hearing, upon fair and impartial testimony.

Until within the last thirty years, no witness would be allowed to give any testimony in a court of justice, who had a direct pecuniary interest in the question; and, even now, since by statute he is made competent to testify, the question of his interest goes very far to weaken its force. It goes directly to the question of his credibility.

No one who knows the human heart, and how prone in man, is "the wish to be father to the thought," can place full confidence in the testimony of witnesses who are directly interested in the question.

Unconsciously a human being may be swayed by his interests, and, without intentional falsification, he may be led

¹¹This is one of the very few letters in the Doolittle private papers and correspondence in which the author is, beyond question, former Senator Doolittle, of Wisconsin. It is a masterly presentation of the money question from his own point of view, a point of view which had engaged his thoughtful attention for many years. It will be seen by the date that the subject was an exceedingly live one at that particular time. And Judge Doolittle could not let an opportunity slip by to commend Senator Vest for his manly speech and attitude upon this most intricate of all public questions of a purely national character.

The erasures, interlineations, additions, substitutions, etc., made with lead pencil in the type-written copy of the letter submitted, are all in the handwriting of Judge Doolittle himself. The contributor can vouch for that.

The "Senator Collamer" mentioned by Mr. Doolittle was the Hon. Jacob Collamer, a United States Senator from Vermont and a senatorial colleague of Senator Doolittle.

DUANE MOWRY.

by them to see only half the truth. As Senator Collamer used to say; "The truth half told is always a lie." Whether intended or not, there is no subject upon which so many half truths are told as upon this very question, what is money, and what is its legitimate office?

The men whose property consists in bonds, mortgages and obligations to pay them in dollars, naturally desire dollars of the greatest possible value, or purchasing power. If all silver dollars can be destroyed as tender in payment, if there are to be only gold dollars, their purchasing power is, of necessity, increased one-third, at least, and perhaps double. They naturally look at the question with one eye—an eye single to their own interests—through gold spectacles.

It is so with all men who live on fixed salaries. The President of the United States with his fixed salary of \$50,000.00, if only gold is to be money, every gold dollar will be as good as two in 1873, when silver was demonetized; and instead of having a salary of \$50,000, at prices under a Bi-Metallic standard, it is nearly doubled now in its purchasing power under the single gold standard, or equal to \$100,000, in 1873. It is so with judges, professors in colleges, bank presidents and railroad presidents. Their salaries are fixed in dollars; and, the dearer the dollars the greater their purchasing power; and these as a general thing are the very men who assume to give testimony all the time for a single gold standard.

On the other hand—the extremists among the silver men, see only half the truth. They see clearly the dangers of a single gold standard;—dangers which I will not repeat, but which I stated at some length, in a speech made at the opera house in Racine, Wisconsin, in January last [1893] before the recent fall in the price of silver occasioned by England, in closing the mints of India to silver coinage.

I repeat, the silver men see these dangers; and, they see or think they see, clearly that the fall in the price of silver is due to demonetization alone. (One half at least is due, I think, to demonetization real and threatened.)

But they look at those dangers with so much intensity, and with such apprehension of financial ruin, that they do not see that other important truth, which comes in as a potent factor in producing the fall in the actual value of silver, and which, in my opinion, causes the other half of the fall in price; that is—its greater and cheaper production.

Before 1878, the silver mines of the world never produced over 73,000,000 ounces annually. Since that time the annual production has nearly doubled. It has gone up to 140,000,000 ounces.

The silver men fail to realize this important fact. They, too, look at this question with only one eye—an eye single to the silver interest alone—through silver spectacles.

What now is needed more than anything else at the head of affairs is men of cool, clear heads, who can look at this question, not with one eye through gold spectacles, nor with the other eye through silver spectacles, but with both eyes, through spectacles of cold steel; who can see both sides of this question, with both eyes, who have knowledge of the history and value of gold and silver as money in all ages, and among all civilized nations, from the beginning of human history;—who have a due regard for their oaths to support the Constitution of the United States; and, who while they will insist on doing full justice to creditors, will not in the name of justice and honesty, lend their power and influence to perpetrate the most gigantic system of robbery and oppression ever conceived among men, viz: The sudden destruction of half the money of redemption of the civilized world.

For myself, I believe at the commercial price to-day, one ounce of gold will exchange for 28 ounces of silver.

I think one-half the fall in silver is to be fairly attributed to its cheaper and more plentiful production.

I think the other half is to be attributed to the action of England, Germany and other states and the United States towards demonetization.

Instead of 16 to 1, it is now 28 to 1, (1893) or has fallen 12/16. Of that fall 6/16 is due to the cheaper production, and 6/16 to the unjust and unnatural war upon silver as money

of redemption. It is like a problem to be worked out when there is one unknown quantity. We must approximate it the best we can.

I would, therefore, if left to me alone, say : 22 ounces of silver is worth one ounce of gold, provided silver is used as a money metal. The Constitution recognizes silver as a money metal. I would, therefore, in obedience to the Constitution, coin all the gold and all the silver which can come to our mints at 22 to 1, and take the responsibility. The annual production of silver is not over 140,000,000 ounces. Mexico would coin her share and probably not over 70,000,000 or one-half of the production of the world would come to us. We could safely coin 70,000,000 ounces annually at 22 to 1. Every silver dollar coming into the Treasury should be re-coined at the same ratio, before being paid out. Then there should be some law by which no bank paper or any other form of paper money should circulate less than \$5.00. There is nothing in England less than \$25, or five pounds. Then gold and silver would be where it ought to be, in the hands of the people themselves, and not stored up so much in the vaults of the Banks and the Government.

I hope you will excuse me for writing such a long letter. I had no idea of it when I began, directly after reading your remarks in the Senate. But without stopping to correct what I have thus hastily written, I send it to you for your consideration.

The times require men of hearts and consciences as well as brains, in dealing with this mightiest of problems for the good of our country.

Very truly yours,

J. R. DOOLITTLE.

FROM G. G. VEST.

Washington, D. C., August 17, 1893.¹¹

My dear sir:—

Accept my thanks for your very kind letter of August 15th.

I appreciate fully the difficulties pointed out by your letter, and think that any one, who can dogmatically assert that the future will bring forth assured results from any given policy, is a very bold man.

About one proposition I do not think there ought to be any controversy, and that is the widespread disaster which will come to our country from a single gold standard. I can very well understand, as I said in my speech, how an Englishman would be for the gold standard, but it is incomprehensible that an American should take that position.

The thing which must give every intelligent mind the greatest trouble is as to our ability to maintain the two metals at a parity without international agreement. I honestly believe that it can be done by increasing the ratio, repealing the Sherman law, and then, if necessary, issuing bonds by the sale of which gold can be put in the treasury, and sustain our financial legislation.

Under ordinary circumstances I should oppose the issuing of bonds for any purpose, but if we propose to maintain the parity of gold and silver, it is beyond question that we must have more gold, I do not see how this can be obtained except by the sale of bonds, unless there should be a series of years in which the crops of the United States would be abundant and those of the outside world very poor.

¹¹This letter of Senator Vest, of Missouri, is in courteous reply to that of Judge Doolittle, which precedes it. It is not often that a copy of Mr. Doolittle's letters are to be found in his correspondence. But here is one that discusses the money question in his most forceful and luminous way. And Mr. Vest, in his somewhat brief answer, recognizes the difficulties of the situation. The subject is so recent in the public mind, that the correspondence is, perhaps, all that the student or investigator will care to know at this time.



The outlook here is very dark and there seems to be little hope of speedy compromise.

The gold men are determined to have an unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, and the friends of silver are equally determined to secure some legislation for that metal.

Your friend,

G. G. VEST.

HON. JAMES R. DOOLITTLE,
Racine, Wisconsin.

✓



The outlook here is very dark and there seems to be little hope of speedy compromise.

The gold men are determined to have an unconditional repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, and the friends of silver are equally determined to secure some legislation for that metal.

Your friend,

G. G. VEST.

HON. JAMES R. DOOLITTLE,
Racine, Wisconsin.

✓